

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 10, 14 and 17 were pending and rejected. Applicants hereby amend claims 2, 5, 6, 12 and 14. Further, Applicants add new claim 18 and 19. Accordingly, claims 2-6, 10, 12, 14 and 17-19 are all the claims pending in the application. Features added in the claim amendments and the new claims are at least supported by page 14, lines 5-22 and page 16, line 7 to page 17, line 24.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hamada (EP 0 850 673) in view of Liu (U.S. Patent No. 6,077,164).

Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2, 5, 6, 12 and 14

Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, “a nurture simulation game device which displays input strings on a game screen as options whereby the player selects the options using an input device, the nurture simulation game device comprising: basic string storage means for storing a plurality of basic strings” and “a substitute string storage means for storing a substitute string corresponding to each of at least one of the plurality of basic strings stored in the basic string storage means when the basic string is not suited for speech recognition and have potential to lead to a drop in speech recognition rate.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Hamada and Liu, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claim 2 recited above.

For instance, Hamada discloses that a player can record his or her preferred voice sounds for each button of the pad. A command for this purpose is input and a desired word is selected

or input and recorded for each item of the pad data. The desired word can be input and recorded by two different ways. First method is by selecting text of the screen (i.e. typing the word) and recording the selected word. Second method is inputting the desired words via a microphone. The difference between the two methods is that, in the first method, by merely selecting the text of the screen, the word being recorded is generic and non-specific to the user. In the second method, the word being stored is specific to the user since the user's voice is being recorded. (page 11, lines 24-31).

However, Hamada merely disclosing a method of storing desired words by either selecting them off the screen or by inputting using a microphone does not teach or suggest a nurture simulation game device which displays input strings on a game screen as options whereby the player selects the options using an input device. Further, the combined references do not teach or suggest the nurture simulation game device including a basic string storage means for storing a plurality of basic strings and a substitute string storage means for storing a substitute string corresponding to each of at least one of the plurality of basic strings stored in the basic string storage means when the basic string is not suited for speech recognition and have potential to lead to a drop in speech recognition rate.

Moreover, Liu at most discloses a keyboard input in which the operator uses the non-speech type input device to input control signals and a speech input where the operator uses the microphone to send control speech to the speech recognition IC 4, and the speech recognition IC converts inputted speech into corresponding speech signal and compares the speech signal with the speech control signals of a data conversion table stores in the second EEPROM 7. However, Liu does not disclose the features discussed above that are missing in Hamada.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hamada and Liu also does not teach or suggest “the basic strings and the substitute strings are different and the substitute string comprises the basic string and additional string attached to the corresponding basic sting.” Specifically, Hamada and Liu, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a substitute string comprising the basis string attached with an additional string.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 5, 6, 12 and 14

Claims 5, 6, 12 and 14 recite subject matter analogous to claim 2, and therefore are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 2.

Claims 4, 10 and 17

Claims 4, 10 and 17 depend from claim one of the independent claims that are allowable, and therefore claims 4, 10, 15 and 16 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Liu and Volk et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,401). Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 3

Applicants respectfully submit that since claim 3 depends from claim 2 and since Volk does not cure the deficiency noted above with respect to claim 2, claim 3 is allowable over the cited reference at least by virtue of its dependency.

New claims

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 2, and therefore are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency, and the additional features recited therein.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ebenesar D. Thomas/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 28, 2009

Ebenesar D. Thomas
Registration No. 62,499